1 2 3 4 5	SLOVAK, BARON, EMPEY, MURPHY Shaun M. Murphy, Esq. (CASB# 194965) Katelyn K. Empey, Esq. (CASB# 292110) 1800 East Tahquitz Canyon Way Palm Springs, California 92262 Telephone: (760) 322-2275 Fax: (760) 322-2107	
6 7	In Association with:	
8	MILES KOWALSKI, Deputy County Counsel (CASB# 257269) JEAN-RENE BASLE, County Counsel (CASB# 134107)	
9	385 North Arrowhead Avenue, 4th Floor San Bernardino, CA 92415-0140 Telephone: (909) 387-5455	
10		
11	Fax: (909) 387-3070	
12	E-mail: Miles.Kowalski@cc.sbcounty.gov	
13	Attorneys for Defendants, JOHN McMAHON & RONALD SINDELAR	
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
15	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
16	 CHEMEHUEVI INDIAN TRIBE, et al.,	Case No. 5:15-CV-01538-DMG (FFM)
17	}	[Case Assigned to: Hon. Dolly M. Gee, Courtroom 8C]
18	Plaintiffs,	
19	vs.	DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO
20	JOHN McMAHON, et al.	REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF
21	Defendants.	PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT;
22		OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT
23		[FRCP 56]
24		Date: June 30, 2017
25		Time: 2:00 p.m.
26		Location: 350 W. 1 st St. Los Angeles, CA 90012
27		Courtroom 8C
28		

DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT [FRCP 56] (Case No. 5:15-cv-01538-DMG-FFM)

Plaintiffs ask this Court to take judicial notice of a Memorandum Opinion and Order in an "as-yet unpublished federal court decision" from the United States District Court, District of New Mexico. Although titled as being in support of their Opposition to Defendants' Motion, the language of the request makes clear that they are attempting to use this document as evidence in support of their Motion, which they contend was not included because it is "very recent" and they only became aware of it after filing. To the extent they are attempting to use this in support of their Motion, it is improper. There is no citation to this new found "evidence". More importantly, the request is also improper as evidence to support their Opposition here, as it is irrelevant.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 201, the court may judicially notice a fact that is not subject to reasonable dispute because it:(1) is generally known within the trial court's territorial jurisdiction; or (2) can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned. (Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 201(b).) Although the Court may judicially notice of a variety of matters under this Rule, only relevant matters may be noticed. (See *City of Lodi v. M&P Invs.*, 308 F.Supp.2d 1137, 1143, fn. 6 (E.D. Cal 2003, holding that judicial notice not appropriate where documents are irrelevant to the issues raised in the motion; *City & County of San Francisco v. Tutor-Saliba Corp*, 218 F.R.D. 219, 222-223 (N.D. Cal 2003), denying judicial notice in part because the document was irrelevant.)

In this case, the Memorandum Opinion and Order was filed in the District of New Mexico and has absolutely no precedential effect on the decision of this Court. Moreover, it does not address the issues in this case—whether Section 36 was is within the boundaries of the Reservation or constitutes "Indian Country." In fact, it does not involve a dispute regarding the establishment of the

1 Reservation or the Tribe whatsoever. A general discussion regarding the Tenth 2 Circuits test for determining whether a piece of land is "Indian Country" has no 3 relevance here, and is not properly subject to judicial notice on this Motion. 4 Based on the foregoing, the Court should deny Plaintiffs' Request. 5 6 SLOVAK BARON EMPEY MURPHY & PINKNEY LLP Date: June 16, 2017 7 8 By: /s/ Shaun M.Murphy 9 Shaun M. Murphy, Esq. Attorney for Defendants 10 11 12 13 14 15 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 16 The undersigned hereby certifies that, on June 16, 2017, a true and correct 17 copy of the foregoing DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO REQUEST FOR 18 JUDICIAL NOTICE SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; OR IN THE 19 ALTERNATIVE, FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT [FRCP 56] was 20 21 served on Plaintiffs in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. 22 /s/ Shaun M. Murphy By: 23 Shaun M. Murphy 24 25 26 27 28